



Evaluation

1. What were the strengths of the meeting

- Small group discussions
- Everyone speaking and sharing as a group
- Openness, ice breakers were very good way to get all involved, concentrated work to get all participants “on the same page”
- Material presented in simple, informative format
- No down times
- The informal give and take of the group-the open nature and exchange-fun atmosphere
- Diversity of members, the FUN we had with the ice-breakers, the useful information
- Learn different way to help everyone
- Mutual respect-listening-fun
- The “light” presentations-they made me appreciate the complexity of the delivery systems
- Good background information to get started
- Team effort
- Great representation of people w/ experience & knowledge

2. Was the material presented in a helpful way

- Yes
- Ok, too many words not enough visuals considering make-up of group (especially the handouts)
- Yes, it was excellent, with visuals, etc.
- It was for me, I like this format
- Got some information that can help finding ways of doing things
- Yes, some overviews were pretty brief but time was a problem
- Bar charts might be a useful way to summarize some data (\$, # served, etc)
- Yes, very good! Medicaid needed to be more focused on our topic

3. Are there certain learning styles that you prefer?

- Visual, power point, using my tape recorder
- You are using tools wonderfully
- Focused discussion
- Visual with written information
- Like the handouts-the ability to ask questions
- Numbers and charts-especially summaries that highlight the primary message being sent
- I liked the workgroups
- I'm visual so handouts are always helpful

4. What were the weaknesses of the meeting?

- Not necessarily a weakness rather an observation-somewhat repetitive info-may be nature of the beast as you work to get all informed, also not clear of what value some of the info received will have on outcome of the workgroup-maybe I'll find out
- Not enough time
- I felt (person) was a good facilitator overall, however was looking for guidance or approval from Wanda (ex: wording-if it was appropriate for grants & if not approved by Wanda not included even though it was our group's word
- I think we need to more clearly articulate what the small groups or group is trying to accomplish each session
- Time to work on PATHs map
- Time
- A lot of material-short time

5. To improve future meetings I would...

- Everything was ok
- Better room location so people can move about freely
- Keep the information flow & visuals/notes
- Ensure accurate size room, allow enough time for discussion-better to run early than be pushed to stay on time
- Have a goal or outcome identified for each section of the agenda
- Prefer more comfortable chairs-would like to start meetings by 8:30 so can get home earlier
- Prefer discussion on specific action items put forth by the project leaders
- Allow more time for discussion/groups

6. After attending the first meeting, is there specific information that you feel would benefit the group for this project?

- Learning more about social security
- Is there any general concept or list of models that exist regarding a “one-stop” concept”? We did not talk much about one-stops.
- The names & agencies represented by members-perhaps you are sending us this information

7. Other

- Follow-up on Core Indicators Project-do something manageable in the information so group can use it/benefit from it
- Tab section in binder for ease of finding info
- Recommend that anyone giving presentations & using handouts 3-hole punch info for ease of filing in binder
- Perhaps the leadership could consider putting the next 6 months on a calendar with a time line for completing specific tasks at each meeting. I know we started that process but maybe we could still do it in a general sense in order to lend urgency to our time together.